



3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600  
Las Vegas, NV 89169-5996  
Facsimile (702) 949-8321  
Telephone (702) 949-8320

Robert M. Charles Jr. NV State Bar No. 006593  
Email: [rcharles@lrlaw.com](mailto:rcharles@lrlaw.com)  
John C. Hinderaker AZ State Bar No. 018024  
Email: [jhinderaker@lrlaw.com](mailto:jhinderaker@lrlaw.com)

Attorneys for USACM Liquidating Trust

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

In re:

USA COMMERCIAL MORTGAGE  
COMPANY,

Debtor.

Case No. BK-S-06-10725-LBR

CHAPTER 11

**OBJECTION OF USACM  
LIQUIDATING TRUST TO PROOF  
OF CLAIM NO. 10725-02094-2 BY  
KAY M. CANTRELL AND DONALD  
L. HESS, AS JTWRORS IN THE  
AMOUNT OF \$49,551,70; AND  
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Date of Hearing: October 18, 2011  
Time of Hearing: 1:30 p.m.

The USACM Liquidating Trust (the "USACM Trust") recently discovered that approximately 140 proofs of claim ("POC's") or portions of proofs of claim had not been properly entered into the database of Sierra Consulting Group, LLC ("Sierra") and, therefore, had not been included in the loan by loan objections filed by the USACM Trust. The POC's discovered by Sierra contain claims that relate to investments in loans that the USACM Trust has already processed on a loan by loan basis. Accordingly, where appropriate the USACM Trust is objecting to these remaining POC's on a claim by claim basis.

Pursuant to § 502 of title 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code (the "Bankruptcy Code") and Rule 3007 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure (the "Bankruptcy Rules"), the USACM Trust requests an order disallowing in full Proof of

1 Claim No. 10725-02094-2 by Kay M. Cantrell and Donald L. Hess, as joint tenants with  
2 right of survivorship, (the “Subject Proof of Claim”) against USA Commercial Mortgage  
3 Company (“USACM”) in the amount of \$49,551.70.<sup>1</sup>

4 Here, the Subject Proof of Claim is based upon a \$50,000 investment in the Roam  
5 Development Loan, which loan the borrower repaid in full. The USACM Trust has filed  
6 omnibus objections to the claims arising out of investments in the Roam Development  
7 Loan. In association with the Roam Development omnibus objections, on January 9,  
8 2009, the USACM Trust filed the Declaration of Edward M. Burr in Support of Omnibus  
9 Objections to Proofs of Claim Based Upon the Investment in the Marquis Hotel Loan  
10 (“Burr Decl.”) [DE 6722].<sup>2</sup> A Copy of the Burr Decl. with the hearing date redacted and  
11 “**Exhibit A**” omitted<sup>3</sup> will be served on Ms. Cantrell and Mr. Hess with this Objection.

## 12 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

### 13 I. BACKGROUND FACTS

#### 14 a. The USACM Bankruptcy

15 On April 13, 2006 (“Petition Date”), USACM filed a voluntary petition for relief  
16 under chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code. Debtor continued to operate its business as  
17 debtor-in-possession pursuant to sections 1107(a) and 1108 of the Bankruptcy Code.  
18 Debtor’s post-petition management of the Debtor was under the direction of Thomas J.  
19 Allison of Mesirow Financial Interim Management, LLC, who served as the Chief  
20 Restructuring Officer.

21  
22  
23 <sup>1</sup> In compliance with Nevada LR 3007, a copy of the Subject Proof of Claim is attached as **Exhibit A**

24 <sup>2</sup> The USACM Trust filed the Burr Decl. [DE 6722] in support of the Roam Development omnibus  
25 objections. The Court heard those omnibus objections and sustained them at the omnibus hearing on  
February 20, 2009.

26 <sup>3</sup> **Exhibit A** to the Burr Decl. lists the Direct Lenders whose claims were affected by the Roam  
Development omnibus objections. Those Direct Lender claims have no relevance to this objection and,  
therefore, **Exhibit A** to the Burr Decl. will not be provided to Ms. Cantrell.

1 USACM was a Nevada corporation that, prior to the Petition Date, was in the  
2 business of underwriting, originating, brokering, funding and servicing commercial loans  
3 primarily secured by real estate, both on behalf of investors and for its own account. That  
4 business included the solicitation of investors to purchase fractional interest in loans that  
5 USACM originated and then serviced. These investors are referred to as “Direct Lenders”  
6 in USACM’s bankruptcy case and in this Objection.

7 The USACM Trust exists as of the Effective Date of the Plan, which was March 12,  
8 2007. Geoffrey L. Berman is the Trustee. Under the Plan, the USACM Trust is the  
9 successor to USACM with respect to standing to seek allowance and disallowance of  
10 Claims under 11 U.S.C. § 502(a).

11 **b. The Roam Development Loan**

12 On or about December 19, 2006, the Roam Development Loan was paid off in full,  
13 as reflected in USACM’s books and records. (Burr Decl. ¶ 9.) Shortly thereafter,  
14 USACM processed the payoff and distributed the proceeds to the Direct Lenders on the  
15 Roam Development Loan. (Burr Decl. ¶ 9.)

16 Minus Unremitted Principal, the Direct Lenders were in turn paid in full, subject to  
17 servicing fees and any other charges under their respective Loan Servicing Agreements  
18 and this Court’s orders, including the Confirmation Order. In general, the Direct Lenders  
19 received their principal and interest on the Roam Development Loan, less Unremitted  
20 Principal and sums withheld for servicing fees, servicer advances, Prepaid Interest and  
21 sums known as the 2% Holdback pursuant to the Confirmed Plan. On the Effective Date  
22 of the Plan, the Prepaid Interest was applied, a portion of the 2% Holdback was applied to  
23 the allowed claims of the Direct Lender Committee, and the balance paid to the Direct  
24 Lenders. (Burr Decl. ¶ 10.)

Accordingly, the USACM Trust no longer has further obligations to the Direct Lenders arising out of the Roam Development Loan to the extent that loan has been repaid to the Direct Lenders, pursuant to USACM's books and records. (Burr Decl. ¶ 11.)

Ms. Cantrell and Mr. Hess do have a valid claim for unremitted principal associated with the Roam Development Loan, but they asserted that claim separately as Proof of Claim 10725-02094-1. Attached as **Exhibit A** is the Subject Proof of Claim, which indicates on page 2 of 4 that Mr. Cantrell and Mr. Hess previously asserted a claim for diverted principal in the amount of \$1,164.97. Attached as **Exhibit B** is Proof of Claim 10725-02094-1 wherein Ms. Cantrell and Mr. Hess asserts a diverted principal claim. The Trust will not object to Proof of Claim 10725-02094-1 and, therefore, it will be deemed allowed.

## II. JURISDICTION

The Court has jurisdiction over this Objection pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1334 and 157. Venue is appropriate under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409. This matter is a core proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 502 and Bankruptcy Rule 3007.

The statutory predicates for the relief requested herein are 11 U.S.C. § 502 and Bankruptcy Rule 3007.

## III. APPLICABLE AUTHORITY

Under the Bankruptcy Code, any Claim for which a proof of claim has been filed will be allowed unless a party in interest objects. If a party in interest objects to the proof of claim, the Court, after notice and hearing, shall determine the amount of the Claim and shall allow the Claim except to the extent that the Claim is "unenforceable against the debtor . . . under any . . . applicable law for a reason other than because such claim is contingent or unmatured." 11 U.S.C. § 502(b). A properly filed proof of claim is presumed valid under Bankruptcy Rule 3001(f). However, once an objection to the proof of claim controverts the presumption, the creditor ultimately bears the burden of

persuasion as to the validity and amount of the claim. *See Ashford v. Consolidated Pioneer Mortg. (In re Consolidated Pioneer Mortg.)*, 178 B.R. 222, 226 (9th Cir. B.A.P. 1995), *aff'd*, 91 F.3d 151 (9th Cir. 1996).

#### IV. OBJECTION

The USACM Trust respectfully requests that the Court disallow in full Proof of Claim No. 10725-02094-2 by Kay M. Cantrell and Donald L. Hess, as joint tenants with right of survivorship. According to USACM's books and records as reconstructed by Mesirow, the Roam Development Loan was repaid in full by the borrower, and the Direct Lenders have in turn received repayment of their investments as provided by the applicable Loan Servicing Agreement, this Court's orders and the Confirmation Order. Ms. Cantrell and Mr. Hess's diverted principal claim associated with the Roam Development Loan will be approved as a general unsecured claim pursuant to Proof of Claim 10725-02094-1, which is a separate proof of claim to which the USACM Trust does not object.

#### V. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the USACM Trust respectfully requests that the Court disallow the Subject Proof of Claim in full. The USACM Trust also requests such other and further relief as is just and proper.

DATED this 17th day of September, 2011.

LEWIS AND ROCA LLP

By /s/ John Hinderaker (#18024)  
Robert M. Charles Jr. NV 6593  
John C. Hinderaker, AZ 18024 (*pro hac vice*)  
3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Telephone: (702) 949-8200  
Facsimile: (702) 949-8398  
E-mail: [jhinderaker@lrlaw.com](mailto:jhinderaker@lrlaw.com)

*Attorneys for the USACM Liquidating Trust*

LEWIS  
AND  
ROCA  
LLP  
LAWYERS

1 Copy of the foregoing and the Burr Decl. [DE 6722]  
2 with the hearing date redacted and Exhibit A  
3 omitted mailed by first class postage prepaid on  
4 September 17, 2011 to:

4 Kay M. Cantrell and Donald L. Hess, jtwros  
5 Donald L. Hess  
6 1818 Madero Drive  
7 The Villages, FL 32159

7 Kay M. Cantrell and Donald L. Hess  
8 1800 Jefferson Park Ave., # 86  
9 Charlottesville, VA 22903

10 LEWIS AND ROCA LLP

11 /s/ Renee L. Creswell  
12 Renee L. Creswell